PB89-201867

Comments on 'Lateral Dispersion from Tall Stacks'

(U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC

17 Apr 87

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completi

PB89-201067

REPORT NO. EPA/600/J-87/480	2.
TITLE AND SUBTITLE: OMMENTS ON "LATERAL DISPERSION FROM TALL STACKS"	5. REPORT DATE
	6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE
AUTHOR(S): ary A. Briggs	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS: (same as block 12)	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. A101/B/64/03 - 6084 (FY-87)
	11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.
12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS: Atmospheric Sciences Research Laboratory - RTP, NC Office of Research and Development U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Research Triangle Park, NC 27711	13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED
	14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE EPA/600/09

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

J. Climate & Appl. Meteorol., Vol. 26, No. 12, 1987

16. ABSTRACT

A few minor errors in Hanna (1986) are noted and several questions are raised about apparent inconsistencies in this paper. One question concerns why substantial enhancement of σ_y by buoyancy was noted for the Bull Run data but was unmentioned for the Kincaid data; information given in the paper suggests similar ranges of X^*/F^* at both plants, but much smaller F^* values at Kincaid, which may account for the lack of noticeable buoyancy effects there. The inconsistency between the recommended equation $\sigma_y/x = 0.6\ w^*/u$ and the σ_y/x values recommended for various stability classes (based on u/w^* ranges) can be removed by multiplying this σ_y expression by a factor which accounts for the effect of mechanical turbulence. Finally, it is noted that an identical equation was recently reported to give a good fit to σ_y from passive sources released above 0.3h, albeit to much smaller distances than reported by Hanna.

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: RELEASE TO PUBLIC	19. SECURITY CLASS *(This Report)* UNCLASSIFIED	21. NO. OF PAGES 5
	20. SECURITY CLASS *(This page)* UNCLASSIFIED	22. PRICE

EPA Form 2220-1 (Rev. 4-77) PREVIOUS EDITION IS OBSOLETE

EPA/600/J-87/480

Reprinted from JOURNAL OF CLIMATE AND APPLIED METEOROLOGY, Vol. 26, No. 12, December 1987
American Meteorological Society

Comments on "Lateral Dispersion from Tall Stacks"

GARY A. BRIGGS

Atmospheric Sciences Research Laboratory, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711

17 April 1987

ABSTRACT

A few minor errors in a paper by Hanna are noted and several questions are raised about apparent inconsistencies. One question is why substantial enhancement of σ_y by buoyancy was noted for the Bull Run data but was unmentioned for the Kincaid data; information given in the paper suggests similar ranges of X^*/F_* at both plants, but much smaller F_* values at Kincaid, which may account for the lack of noticeable buoyancy effects there. The inconsistency between the recommended equation $\sigma_y/x = 0.6w_*/u$ and the σ_y/x values recommended for various stability classes (based on u/w^* ranges) can be removed by multiplying this σ_y expression by a factor which accounts for the effect of mechanical turbulence. Finally, it is noted that an identical equation was recently reported to give a good fit to σ_y from passive sources released above 0.3 h, albeit to much smaller distances than reported by Hanna.

The paper by Hanna (1986) on lateral dispersion provides very useful analyses of EPRI measurements of plumes from tall stack, large buoyancy sources. However, there are a few errors in the equations, and there are a few inconsistencies which beg further discussion.

The errors that I noticed all originate in section 3e, which pertains to buoyancy effects on σ_y. Equation (15) should be multiplied by u^{-1} on the right-hand side. In Eq. (16), the exponent of X^* should be preceded by a minus sign. Then we find that Eqs. (14) and (16) are equal when X^*/F_* equals $(1.6/0.6)^3 \approx 19$, not 17. (This erroneous calculation is carried over into the transition values of X^*/F_* recommended in the summary.)

I am puzzled by the fact that Hanna gives convincing evidence of enhancement of σ_y by buoyancy effects at Bull Run, yet says nothing about the presence or absence of such effects at Kincaid. He suggests that buoyancy effects dominate σ_y at smaller nondimensional distances, namely, at $X^*/F_* = xw_*^3/F < 17$ (or 19; see previous paragraph). Yet he reports that $F \approx 1000$ m^4 s^{-3} and $w_* \approx 1.5$ m s^{-1} at both power plants. Therefore, it would seem that $X^*/F_* \approx x/(300$ m) at both plants, so the Kincaid database would also contain many $X^*/F_* < 17$ data points. Are these points consistent with Eqs. (15) and (16), or do they show no evidence of σ_y enhancement by F?

Perhaps the answer involves a second criterion necessary for buoyancy enhancement of σ_y, mentioned by Hanna in section 3e but omitted from the summary. That is, according to Briggs (1985), this enhancement of σ_y is noticeable at the surface only when $F_* > 0.06$. In such cases, plumes rise to the top of the mixing layer, at $z = h$, and are squeezed outward laterally by the force of their residual buoyancy (relative to the air below h) acting against the "ceiling" of overlying stable air (provided that this air has sufficiently higher potential temperature than does the lofted plume, so that penetration of the stable air is prevented). However, if $F_* < 0.06$, plumes do not evidence this effect on σ_y at the surface because most plume material is pushed downward by convective downdrafts before it reaches h; when the ambient turbulence can overpower buoyancy in this way, it also causes more lateral dispersion than does buoyancy. While X^*/F_* ranges may be roughly in the same range at both plants, F_* values may be generally smaller at Kincaid because $F_* \propto u^{-1}$ and wind speeds were substantially larger there than at Bull Run. I would like to see plots like Hanna's Fig. 12 for both plants with either data screened by F_* or identification of points by F_* range.

There is a hidden inconsistency between the recommended Eq. (14), $\sigma_y/x = 0.6\ w_*/u$, and the σ_y/x ratios recommended for various stability classes in section 3b. It should be emphasized that the stability classes used by Hanna (1986) are not the original Pasquill classes based on u and insolation, but are Weil and Brower's (1984) classes based on u/w_* ratios. [Because $w_* = (H^*h)^{1/3}$ and the surface buoyancy flux, H^*, is well correlated with insolation, there is substantial correlation of these classes with Pasquill's; however, the Pasquill scheme does not account for the influence of h on turbulence intensity.] Weil and Brower's u/w_* ranges corresponding to classes A, B, C, and D are <3.5, 3.5–6, 6–14, and >14, respectively. However, the σ_y/x ratios recommended by Hanna for the same classes agree with Eq. (14) only if $u/w_* = 2.5$, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. These ratios reasonably agree with Weil and Brower's for the A class but are disturbingly smaller for the less unstable classes, particularly C and D. If

Hanna's σ_y/x recommendations are valid, then Eq. (14) very much underestimates σ_y in the latter classes.

This inconsistency is probably due to the effects of mechanical turbulence, neglected in Eq. (14). Hicks (1985) reports a good fit to turbulence measurements with $\sigma_v = (3.6u_*^2 + 0.35w_*^2)^{1/2}$, where u_* is friction velocity. If $\sigma_y \approx \sigma_v x/u$ and $u/u^* \approx 16$, say, at least in neutral and slightly unstable conditions, then we can use Hicks' σ_v to write

$$\sigma_y/x \approx 0.6(w_*/u)[1 + (0.2u/w_*)^2]^{1/2}.$$

For example, in the C class, $u/w_* \approx 9$ and this equation yields a σ_y larger by a factor of 2.06 than that given by Hanna's Eq. (14): $\sigma_y/x \approx 0.6(2.06)/9 = 0.14$, which is reasonably in agreement with Hanna's recommendation of 0.15 for the C class. Even in the B class, the enhancement factor due to u_* ranges up to 1.56. Therefore, Eq. (14) should be recommended only for very unstable conditions. For moderately unstable to neutral conditions, modification of this equation, as suggested previously, should give a much better fit to data such as shown in Hanna's Fig. 6.

Apropos to Hanna's (1986) finding of near-linear σ_y growth in x at Kincaid, it is worthwhile to note that similar observations of σ_y behavior from *nonbuoyant* elevated sources were recently reported (Briggs et al., 1986). These data were from the CONDORS experiment, conducted in 1982 and 1983 at the Boulder Atmospheric Observatory in Colorado. They were collected in very unstable conditions, with a median value of $u/w_* = 1.5$. Although X^* values did not exceed 4, lateral diffusion from releases below 0.3 h approximately fit the Briggs (1985) expression, Eq. (13) in Hanna (1986). On the other hand, σ_y from the more elevated releases better fit the linear growth equation $\sigma_y = 0.6xw_*/u$, which is identical to Hanna's Eq. (14). However, unusually large wind direction shears were noted at this site (Briggs et al., 1986; Kaimal et al., 1986). These shears were thought to be due to the opposition of thermally induced upslope winds on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains and the upper-level winds, and were suspected to be the cause of larger σ_y (at $X^* > 0.3$) for releases at $z > 0.3$ h at this site. Hanna (1986) raises the interesting possibility that, for quite elevated releases in unstable conditions, linear growth of σ_y occurs at sites distant from tall mountain ranges and to much larger distances than were monitored during CONDORS.

REFERENCES

Briggs, G. A., 1985: Analytical parameterizations of diffusion: The CBL. *J. Climate Appl. Meteor.*, **24**, 1167–1186.

——, W. L. Eberhard, J. E. Gaynor, W. R. Moninger and T. Uttal, 1986: Convective diffusion field measurements compared with laboratory and numerical experiments. Extended abstracts, *Fifth Joint Conf. on Applications of Air Pollution Meteor.*, Chapel Hill, Amer. Meteor. Soc., 340–343.

Hanna, S. R., 1986: Lateral dispersion from tall stacks. *J. Climate Appl. Meteor.*, **25**, 1426–1433.

Hicks, B. B., 1985: Behavior of turbulence statistics in the convective boundary layer. *J. Climate Appl. Meteor.*, **24**, 607–614.

Kaimal, J. C., W. L. Eberhard, W. R. Moninger, J. E. Gaynor, S. W. Troxel, T. Uttal, G. A. Briggs and G. E. Start, 1986: Project CONDORS: Convective diffusion observed by remote sensors. NOAA/ERL/Boulder Atmospheric Observatory Report No. 7, 305 pp. [Available from NOAA/ERL, Boulder, CO.]

Weil, J. C., and R. P. Brower, 1984: An updated Gaussian plume model for tall stacks. *J. Air Pollution Control Assoc.*, **34**, 818–827.

NOTICE

This document has been reviewed in accordance with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency policy and approved for publication. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

This article documents research that was conducted under the auspices of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). As an arm of the government, the USEPA has a paid up, non-exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to reproduce, prepare derivative works, and distribute to the public all of the material contained herein, and to grant others acting on its behalf the right to do so. The USEPA grants to the National Technical Information Service, Department of Commerce, the right to act as its agent in the distribution of this material.

Reply

STEVEN R. HANNA

Sigma Research Corporation, Lexington, MA 02173

15 June 1987

I appreciate the comments by Dr. Briggs (1987) on my paper. I have learned over the past 20 years to listen carefully to him, since his conclusions are usually correct. I apologize for the typographical errors in section 3e.

The emphasis on the Bull Run data in the discussion of the enhancement of σ_y by buoyancy effects (Hanna, 1986) was a result of the sequence in which the original analysis was performed. No buoyancy enhancement correction was needed for the Kincaid data (my Fig. 10), which were analyzed before the Bull Run data, since the observed ratio $\sigma_y u/w_* x$ was constant (about 0.6) at small X^*. However, the observed $\sigma_y u/w_* x$ data showed a slight upturn at small X^* for Bull Run (my Fig. 11). The buoyancy enhancement formula allows this upturn to be simulated. Briggs is correct that, for consistency, the Kincaid analysis should have been redone using the buoyancy enhancement formula.

As he points out, enhancement of σ_y by buoyancy effects may be more evident at Bull Run because the wind speed is smaller and hence the dimensionless buoyancy flux F_* is more often greater than 0.06 at that site than at Kincaid.

The inconsistency mentioned by Briggs between the recommended Eq. (14), $\sigma_y/x = 0.6w_*/u$, and the σ_y/x ratios recommended for various stability classes is not evident in the data. These formulas are empirical fits to the observed data. His suggested formula, $\sigma_y/x = 0.6(w_*/u)[1 + (0.2u/w_*)^2]^{1/2}$, may, perhaps, provide a better fit to the data, but it is not known whether the scatter is less than for my Eq. (14). It would be interesting to plot the data in this way in a future research program. Incidentally, during the course of this project, it was discovered that the Weil and Brower (1984) relation between u/w_* and Pasquill stability classes may need to be corrected, since the Weil and Brower criteria hardly ever generate class D stability during the daytime, whereas the Pasquill scheme often generates class D stability.

This is an appropriate time to report recent findings in two separate tracer studies that it is difficult to reconcile σ_y values directly calculated from cross-wind networks of monitors (Hanna, 1986) with σ_y values estimated from the Gaussian relation ($\sigma_y = C_y/\sqrt{2\pi C_m}$) between the observed maximum ground-level concentration, C_m, and the observed cross-wind integrated ground level concentration, C_y. The σ_y values typically differ by 20% to 40%, with the directly calculated value being larger. Since C_m, C_y and σ_y are all based on extensive tracer measurements, the discrepancy must be due to the non-Gaussian nature of the lateral concentration distribution. For instance, the observed C_m always will lie above a best-fit Gaussian curve for any observed lateral distribution. Thus, the σ_y formulas based on observed lateral concentration distributions produce estimates of C_m that are likely to be 20% to 40% low.

REFERENCES

Briggs, G. A., 1987: Comments on "Lateral dispersion from tall stacks". *J. Climate Appl. Meteor.*, **26**, 1779–1780.

Hanna, S. R., 1986: Lateral dispersion from tall stacks. *J. Climate Appl. Meteor.*, **25**, 1426–1433.

Weil, J. C., and R. P. Brower, 1984: An updated Gaussian plume model for tall stacks. *J. Air Poll. Control Assoc.*, **34**, 818–827.

© 1987 American Meteorological Society